UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,861	02/06/2001	Hiroshi Sasaki	MA-470-US	6868

466 7590 03/31/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/776,861	SASAKI, HIROSHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-10,12-14,16 and 17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-10,12-14,16 and 17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 4, 11, 15 and 18-25 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 is maintained.

Applicant argues, (1) "Claims 1-25 are rejected as anticipated by ADAMS et al. 6,457,030. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The claimed subject matter, i.e., the data conversion unit 1) determines whether conversion is supported by the terminal device, 2) deletes contents not supported by the terminal device, 3) converts contents supported by the terminal device, 4) determines whether the contents are image data, 5) determines whether the constraint information exists in a storage unit, 6) converts the contents when the constraint information exists, and 7) returns the contents to a protocol conversion device without information exists, is not disclosed. As the reference does not disclose that which is recited, the anticipation rejection is not viable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "the data conversion unit 1) determines whether conversion is supported by the terminal device, 2) deletes contents not supported by the terminal device, 3) converts contents supported by the terminal device, 4) determines whether the contents are image data, 5) determines whether the constraint information exists in a storage unit, 6) converts the contents when the constraint information exists, and 7) returns the contents to a protocol conversion device without information exists",

has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action), necessitated by the applicant's amendment. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Priority

3. Applicant was requested (i.e., previous office action dated 6/28/2004) to submit the translated priority document in English for the Japan priority papers submitted on 2/6/2001 (i.e., Japan 11-279515, 02/09/2000 application) for verification in order to benefit the effective date as 02/09/2000. However, the examiner for consideration has not received the translated priority document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Amended claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Amended claims 1, 10 and 14 recite the limitations, "said contents", "the contents", "said one of said contents", "said constraint information", "said converted contents". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple contents, multiple constraint information, multiple converted contents and multiple protocols, exists in the claim, it

is not clear which contents, constraint information and converted contents is referred by theses limitations.

Amended claims 7, 8, 12 and 16 recite the limitations, "said constraint information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple constraint information and multiple protocols, exists in the claim, it is not clear which constraint information is referred by theses limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. 6,457,030, IBM (Hereinafter Adams-IBM) in view of Fletcher et al., IBM, 6,138,156 (Hereinafter Fletcher-IBM).

7. As per claims 1, 10 and 14 Adams- IBM clearly teaches a data conversion system (e.g., figure 2) comprising:

a terminal device belonging to a first communication network (e.g., hand held device display, col., 2, lines 13 – 47),

a server device (e.g., web server, col., 2, lines 2 – 26) belonging to a second communication network having a protocol (e.g., http, col., 1, lines 11 – 30) different from that of said first communication network (e.g., WAP, col., 7, lines 55-57);

a protocol conversion device provided at a connection point (e.g., proxy server, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13) between said first communication network and said second communication network for conducting protocol conversion (e.g., data conversion from one protocol to another, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13),

storage unit which stores (e.g., use of stored information by the transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13) constraint information peculiar to said terminal device added to a request from said terminal device for obtaining contents from said server device (e.g., transmission of WAP requests with the addition of height, width, etc. by the hand held device, col., 8, lines 16 – 61),

a data conversion unit which converts said contents obtained from said server device (e.g., use of transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion at a proxy server, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13) into data based on said constraint information stored in said storage unit (e.g., use of stored information by the transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13),

said data conversion unit (e.g., use of transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion at a proxy server, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13) determines whether conversion to contents supported by said terminal device (col., 2, lines 13 – 47) is necessary (e.g., information transcoded/transfored when necessary, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13).

However, Adams-IBM does not specifically mention about verification steps for conversion.

Fletcher-IBM teaches the well-known concept of determining whether conversion of contents is possible (e.g., use of transcoding algorithm, col., 7, lines 24 – 48, col., 10, lines 39 –

63), when conversion of the contents is necessary but conversion to the contents supported by the device is impossible (e.g., usage of rule definition tool for content modification rules, usage of transform definition tool for content transforms, and usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, col., 9, line 52 – col., 10, line 13), deleting the contents (e.g., col., 8, lines 2 – 55), when conversion of the contents is necessary and conversion to the contents supported by the device is possible (e.g., usage of rule definition tool for content modification rules, usage of transform definition tool for content transforms, and usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, col., 13, lines 9 –58), converting the contents to converted contents supported by the device (e.g., col., 13, lines 30 – 45), determining whether one of the converted contents and the contents are image data (e.g., col., 13, lines 34 – 50), when the one of the contents and the converted contents are not image data (e.g., usage of rule definition tool for content modification rules, usage of transform definition tool for content transforms, and usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, col., 9, lines 15 – 60), said data conversion unit returns the one of the contents and the converted contents to the device without further conversion (e.g., col. 12, lines 38 – 64), when the one of the contents and the converted contents are image data (e.g., col., 13, lines 34 – 50), said data conversion unit determines whether the constraint information exists in the storage (e.g., usage of rule definition tool for content modification rules, usage of transform definition tool for content transforms, and usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, col., 10, lines 1 – 15, col., 13, lines 9 – 48), when the constraint information exists converting the one of the contents and the converted contents to converted image contents based on the constraint information (e.g., col., 8, lines 21 – 63) and returns said converted image contents to the device (e.g., usage of rule definition tool for content modification rules, usage of transform

definition tool for content transforms, and usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, col., 12, lines 6 – 34), when no constraint information exists the device returns the one of the contents and the converted contents to the device without conversion based on the constraint information (e.g., col., 12, lines 34 – 67, use of rule definition tool for content modification rules, use of transform definition tool for content transforms, usage of content filters and transcoding algorithm, figure 4, col., 7, line 24 – col., 8, line 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Adams-IBM with the teachings of Fletcher-IBM in order to facilitate determining whether conversion of contents is possible along with other verification steps for conversion because the determination of conversion would help the software know to perform conversion of the contents. Upon determination that the conversion is necessary the software would help convert the contents. Upon determination that the conversion is not possible, the software would help not convert the contents and handle the contents as needed, using the storage of the device. The software would help conversion of the image data depending upon the necessity of the conversion and to support the converted image contents for the device.

8. As per claim 3, Adams also teaches the following:

data conversion means is provided at said protocol conversion device (e.g., use of transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion at a proxy server, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13).

9. As per claim 5, Adams also teaches the following:

said protocol conversion device includes said data conversion unit and storage unit (e.g., accessing the stored information from storage by the transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13).

10. As per claim 6, Adams also teaches the following:

data conversion means is provided at said server device (e.g., use of transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion at a web server, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13).

11. As per claim 7, Adams also teaches the following:

said protocol conversion device transmits said request received from said terminal device and said constraint information added to said request to said server device (e.g., transmission of WAP requests with the addition of height, width, etc. by the hand held device, col., 8, lines 16 – 61), and said server device includes said storage unit and said data conversion unit (e.g., accessing the stored information from storage by the transcoder/transformer logic for data conversion, col., 7, line 37 – col., 8, line 13).

12. As per claims 8, 12, 16, Adams also teaches the following:

said constraint information includes at least one of size information of images (e.g., height, width, col., 8, lines 45 – 61) and gradation information of images (e.g., fidelity, col., 8, lines 45 – 61).

13. As per claims 9, 13, 17, Adams also teaches the following:

first communication network is a communication network for portable information terminals (e.g., use of WAP, col., 7, lines 55-57) and said second communication network is the Internet (e.g., use of HTTP and internet, col., 1, lines 11 – 30).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

March 27, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100